

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please delete Fig. 32.

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to a Final Office action dated December 4, 2006. Claims 1, 8-17, and 19, and 21-17 were examined. Paragraphs added in the August 18, 2005 Response to Office Action regarding Fig. 32 and Fig. 32 have been deleted as applicants submit that Fig. 32 is not required under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for the pending claims.

By way of the present amendment claims 1, 8-17, 19, and 21-25 are being canceled and new claims 28-35 are being added. Thus, claims 26-35 are pending in the application.

Drawing Objections

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing all features in the claims. The Office action says that the drawings must show the “transmit controller,” the “receive controller” and the “width register.” Applicants note that such features are already shown in the drawings. For example, see Figs. 4 and 5 showing transmit and receive controllers. See also Fig. 31 showing link width registers for the upstream and downstream side. Accordingly, applicants submit that the claims comply with 37 CFR 1.83(a) and respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Priority Objections

The Examiner asserts that the claimed subject matter in this application is not supported in the prior parent application, and thus, this application is not a continuation application. Applicants respectfully disagree and direct the Examiner’s attention to, e.g., the issued parent at col. 40, line 37 to col. 41, line 10 and Figs. 3, 4, 5, and 31. Each aspect of the claims is supported in the parent. Applicants note that the Examiner has not explained what specifically in the claims is not supported stating only that the “claimed subject matter of this application is NOT supported.” Applicants respectfully submit that all claims, including those currently pending, are fully supported in the parent application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to point out with specificity what in the claims is not supported in the parent should the Examiner maintain his position regarding priority.

*Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and § 103*

Claims 1, 8-17, 19, and 21-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,911,053 to Pawlowski (hereinafter, “Pawlowski”). Claims 1, 13-17, and 21-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 6,202,116 to Hewitt (hereinafter, “Hewitt”). Claims 8-12 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as unpatentable over Hewitt. The applicants have amended the claims and believe the rejection to be moot in view of the amended claims. However, there are several issues applicants think are worth addressing.

First, applicants respectfully submit that the Hewitt ‘116 patent is not a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) since the reference did not issue more than a year before the priority date of the instant application. Further, applicants note that the Hewitt ‘116 patent is not available as a reference under a §103(c) as the subject matter in the patent and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same company or subject to an obligation to assign to the same company. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103 was improper.

While applicants appreciate the reminder from the Examiner of obligations under 35 CFR § 1.56, applicants note that two other Hewitt applications that include the two figures in the ‘116 patent have been of record since filing and have been considered by the Office. An Information Disclosure Statement is being submitted herewith to ensure all references in the parent application are printed on the front of any patent issuing from the instant application.

With respect to claim 26, applicants submit Pawlowski fails to teach setting in a transmit width field in the first device a transmit width of a transmit portion of the first communication link interface based on a lesser of a maximum transmit width of the transmit portion of the first communication link interface specified in a maximum transmit width field on the first device and a maximum receive width of a receive portion of a second communication link interface in the second device. Applicants note that Pawlowski fails to teach a communication link having a separate transmit portion and a receive portion and separate fields corresponding to those portions. Fig. 4 of Pawlowski makes clear that the data width indicator 401 is for the

bidirectional bus 101, whichever the direction of transfer. Thus, applicants submit that Pawlowski fails to teach claims 26 and 27.

With respect to claim 28, applicants submit that Pawlowski fails to teach providing a receive width field, a transmit width field, a maximum receive width field and a maximum transmit width field, the maximum receive and transmit width fields specifying a physical size of the separate transmit and receive portions, respectively, for the communication link. All of those fields are simply not taught in Pawlowski. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 28 and all claims dependent thereon distinguish over Pawlowski.

With respect to claim 31, applicants submit that Pawlowski fails to teach configuration registers for configuring a link interface for a communication link, the communication link including a transmit portion and a receive portion separate from the transmit portion, the configuration registers including a receive width field, a maximum receive width field, a transmit width field, and a maximum transmit width field, and wherein the maximum receive width field provides a physical width of the transmit portion of the link on the integrated circuit, and wherein the maximum transmit width field provides a physical width of the transmit portion of the link on the integrated circuit; and wherein the receive width field specifies the receive width of the receive portion and the transmit width field specifies the transmit width of the transmit portion. Those fields and a communication link with separate transmit and receive portions are not taught in Pawlowski. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 31 and all claims dependent thereon distinguish over the Pawlowski.

In summary, claims 26-35 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

- deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed as shown above.
- facsimile transmitted to the USPTO.
- transmitted using the USPTO electronic filing system.



Mark Zagorin

2/20/07  
Date

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Zagorin, Reg. No. 36,067  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
(512) 338-6311 (direct)  
(512) 338-6300 (main)  
(512) 338-6301 (fax)

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: \_\_\_\_\_